

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter elaborates methodological aspects in conducting this research covering research design, research site and participants, data collection, and data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

This study was designed as a descriptive research design. Descriptive research can be either quantitative or qualitative. Descriptive research involves gathering data that describe events and then organize, tabulates, depicts, and describes the data collection (Glass & Hopping, 1984). Along with Rog (1998) who suggests that descriptive studies can answer questions such as “what is” or “what was”, as in this study, researcher address two research questions which should be conducted utilizing both qualitative and quantitative data to enrich the result of the study, the questions are below:

1. What kinds of corrective feedback do the student receive from the teacher?
2. What are the attitudes and preferences toward teacher corrective feedback among students on their pronunciation error?

3.2 Research Site and Participants

This study was conducted at a Junior High School in Bandung. The participants involved were a teacher and third graders of Junior High School. The recruitment of the participants (for the interview) was performed by employing *purposive sampling* (Cresswell, 1997). The third graders were purposively chosen by respecting consideration as follow:

- a. They experienced in making error in pronunciation
- b. They have been given corrective feedback by their teacher
- c. They were ready to spend time during the study
- d. They would work cooperatively during the process of the study.

3.3 Data Collection

In this research, the data was collected by using instruments namely questionnaire and interview.

3.3.1 Interview

Interview was used based on the assumption that the participants' perspectives are meaningful, knowable, and can be made explicit (Yin, 1989). Interview was used to dig more information from the students and also from the teacher toward the techniques implied by the teachers and also the student's responses.

A semi-structures interview with open-ended questions was employed in this research to get in-depth information from students about corrective feedback received from their teacher based on their pronunciation error and responses towards the CF given and also information from teacher about corrective feedback used to correct students' pronunciation error and also teacher's opinion towards kind of CF. Despite, during the interview session, researcher also could ask new questions if the questions were still related to the topic in order to go deeper into the information of the participants (Hatch, 2002, as cited in Sudjasmara, 2013).

In conducting the interview, researcher used participant's first language, Bahasa Indonesia, for better understanding (DeRoche and Lahman, 2008). During the interview, the information was audio-taped. Suggested by Gay, Mills, Airasian (2009, as cited in Sudjasmara, 2013) audio tapes are convenient and reliable, still the original data is available at any time.

Table 3.1 The Distribution of Questions in the Student's Interview

No	Category	Item number
1	Pronunciation error made by students	2,5,8,11
2	kinds of corrective feedback used in correcting error	4,7,10,13
3	Students' response toward given corrective feedback	14,15
4	Student's preference on kinds of teacher corrective feedback	16,17
5	General question related to pronunciation error	1

Table 3.2 The Distribution of Question in Teacher's Interview

No	Category	Item number
1	Pronunciation error made by students	2,5
2	Kinds of corrective feedback used in correcting error	4,7
3	Students' response toward given corrective feedback	8,9
4	General question related to pronunciation error	1

3.3.2 Questionnaire

The questionnaire consists of a set of statement in the scale which should be completed by respondents (Best and Kahn, 1998: 298). In this study researcher used two questionnaires. The first questionnaire was distributed to the students to know whether they experienced being corrected by using Corrective feedback from their teacher or not. The second questionnaire used is a model of questionnaire proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) named The Questionnaire for Corrective Feedback Approaches (QCFAs). It was used to investigate the student's preference of error

correction. There are six corrective feedback approaches of error correction at the first place: explicit correction to provide the correct form explicitly; recast to reformulate all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error; clarification request to indicate to student that the utterance is ill-formed; metalinguistic feedback to provide comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance; elicitation to get the students to produce the correct form by asking the students to repeat the utterance in a reformulated version; and repetition to repeat the student's error (Park, 2010). Yet, researcher will only use five of the approaches which are explicit correction, recast, metalinguistic feature, repetition, and clarification request. Elicitation is dropped because it seems similar to clarification request and explicit correction.

The QCFA's were distributed to the students, the researcher asked them to check (v) on the column of each pronunciation aspect of each of the fifth CFAs they want their teacher to use in class.

Table 3.3 the Distribution of Questions in the 1st Questionnaire, Part 1

No	Category	Item number
1	Pronunciation error on segmental features	1,2
2	Pronunciation error on suprasegmental features	3,4

Table 3.4 the Distribution of Questions in the 1st Questionnaire, Part 2

No	Category	Item number
1	Explicit correction in correcting pronunciation error on segmental features	1
2	Explicit correction in correcting pronunciation error on suprasegmental features	1
3.	Recast in correcting pronunciation error on segmental features	2
4.	Recast in correcting pronunciation error on segmental features	2
5.	Clarification request in correcting pronunciation error on segmental features	3
6.	Clarification request in correcting pronunciation error on suprasegmental features	3
7.	Metalinguistic feedback in correcting pronunciation error on segmental features	4
8.	Metalinguistic feedback in correcting pronunciation error on suprasegmental features	4
9.	Repetition in correcting pronunciation error on segmental features	5
10.	Repetition in correcting pronunciation error on suprasegmental features	5

Table 3.4 the Distribution of Questions in the 2nd Questionnaire

No	Preference on Types of Corrective Feedback	Item number
1	Explicit correction	1
2	Recast	2
3	Clarification Request	3
4	Metalinguistic Feedback	4
5	Repetition	5

3.4 Data Analysis

As the purpose of this study is to investigate student's responses toward teacher corrective feedback on pronunciation error, it is necessary to choose suitable methods of data analysis to ensure that the data is treated thoroughly and the conclusions drawn can be substantiated (Shilkin, 2005).

Descriptive research design was used in this study to analyze the data gathered. According to Glass & Hopping (1984) descriptive research design involves gathering data that describe events and then organize, tabulates, depicts, and describes the data collection (Glass & Hopping, 1984)

3.4.1 Interview

Data analysis of interview was conducted in between the questionnaires. The data were divided into two, teacher and students data. For the teacher's data, as stated in the data collection, it was audio-taped, while for students, it used voice note. First, both audio-taped and voice note interviews were transcribed. After transcribing audio-taped and voice note interviews, the next stage involved analyzing the interview data: classifying and interpreting. The data were classified based on the category: pronunciation error {error in segmental features (SF) and error in suprasegmental features (SSF)}, kinds of corrective feedback used in correcting error {explicit correction (EC), recast (RC), clarification request (CR), metalinguistic feedback (MF), and repetition (RP)}, and students' responses {angry (A), shame (S), confused (C), indifference (I), and contentment (CT)}. After that, it was interpreted. The interview data were used to find the types or error occurred in the classroom activity and the techniques used by the teacher in correcting it and also to analyze the response showed by the students.

3.4.2 Questionnaire

The questionnaires were conducted before and after interpreted the interviews. The first questionnaires were distributed (before the interview) to the students after they were given an explanation on how they have to fill it. It took only 20 minutes to collect the entire first questionnaire.

The QCFA's were distributed (after the interview) after the researcher gave an explanation about it. The researcher used the whole class and asked them to complete the questionnaire honestly and sincerely.

Any questions that arose while completing the questionnaire were encouraged and welcomed. It took about 30 minutes to collect the data, including the explanation about the five corrective feedback approaches.

For data analysis, the data from the first questionnaire was analyzed into numbers, 1 (one) for "yes, I have" and 0 (zero) for "No, I never" The second data from QCFA, researcher tabulated the result of the five corrective feedback approaches by teacher with 1 meaning 'I want my error to be corrected using this technique' and 0 'I don't want my error to be corrected using this technique.'

3.5 Concluding Remark

This chapter has elaborated the research design, research site and participants, data collection and data analysis. The next chapter will elaborated research findings and discussions.